

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Ripley, et al. Application No.: 10/653,690 Filed: 09/02/2003 Title: Remote Scoring and Aggregating Similarity Search Engine for Use with Relational Databases	Group Art Unit: 2163 Examiner: Linh Black Attorney Docket No.: 800716
--	---

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.111

Introductory Comments

Enclosed with this Office Action Response is a Petition for Revival of an Application for Patent Abandoned Unintentionally Under 37 CFR 1.137(b) and a fee under 37 CFR 1.17(m).

Please enter the following claim amendments in response to the Office Action received from the Office having a mail date of June 30, 2006. In that correspondence, the Office has rejected claims 1-47 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,606, and rejected claims 1-24, 27-41 and 44-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being unpatentable over Liddy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,940), and further in view of Stellwagen, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,755). Claims 14-16 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,940), Stellwagen, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,755), and further in view of Lang et

al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/00838891). Claims 25-26 and 42-43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants have included a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CR 1.131(c) and a Declaration of Common Ownership in Appendix A, in addition to a fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d) to overcome the rejection based on nonstatutory double patenting. Regarding the objection to claim 17, the specification has been amended to further describe FIG. 34 and FIG. 36 and the use of template value. Applicants have also amended the claims and presented arguments to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) presented by the Office. Applicants contend that, based on the following amendments and discussion, there are patentably distinguishable claimed features between the invention represented by these claims and the cited reference disclosures of Liddy et al., Stellwagen, Jr. and Lang et al.

Entering of the following amendments, reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested. Support for all amendments is found within the specification. No new matter has been entered as a result of these amendments.